DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 357 PS 013 211

AUTHOR Adler, Peter; Adler, Patricia S.
TITLE The Carpool: An Uninvestigated Setting for Early Childhood Socialization.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (San Francisco, CA, September, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adults; Behavior Patterns; *Children; Early Childhood Education; Friendship; *Interaction; *Peer Relationship; Role Models; *Socialization
IDENTIFIERS *Car Pools

ABSTRACT

Numerous childhood activities and relationships have been studied within the context of socialization, but one form of interpersonal experience has not yet been investigated by social researchers: the carpool. This paper investigates the types of interaction which take place within the carpool setting, both between children and adults and among peer group members. The authors conducted 50 intensive taped interviews with carpool parents, talked with teachers and administrators at several private schools attended by the children of the sample population, and observed events occurring both during and relating to their child's carpool as well as events in the carpool experiences of friends' and neighbors' children. These interviews and observations supplemented over 800 carpool trips the authors had personally participated in as they drove to school, camp, and after-hours activities over a 3-year period. Results demonstrated that apart from their function as educators, the most significant socializing influence carpooling adults have on children is to serve as role models, demonstrating and stressing the importance of certain values and behavioral norms. These include appropriate automobile safety; tolerance for other people; respect for people's feelings, privacy and personal space; and fairness in treating people equally. As for the child-child interaction, results indicated that most of the children's carpool play was characterized by friendship and cooperation. When friendship and cooperation break down they may be replaced by antagonism, meanness and hostility. The authors conclude by assessing how carpooling socialization corresponds to the three primary models of socialization - internalization of society's norms and values, learning roles for future use, and developing interactional competence - depicted by sociologists. (MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223357

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE CARPOOL:

AN UNINVESTIGATED SETTING FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD SOCIALIZATION

Peter Adler
University of Tulsa

Patricia S. Adler
Tulsa Junior College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter Adler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS013211

This paper was presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, California, September, 1982.

Empirical studies and conceptual explorations of the complex process by which children develop into adults have tended to focus on three primary models of socialization: internalization of society's norms and values (cf. Parsons and Bales, 1955 and Miller and Swanson, 1958); learning roles for future use (cf. Brimm, 1960 and Mead, 1934), and developing interactional competence (cf. Speier, 1970). Various socializing agencies and groups, such as families, schools, peer groups and the mass media, are most commonly credited with guiding children through this learning experience. Numerous childhood activities and relationships have been studied within the context of socialization, but one form of interpersonal experience remains as yet uninvestigated by social researchers: the carpool.

To an increasing degree, carpooling has become a modern urban and suburban institution as families band together to save time, money and energy in providing transportation for their children who are either too young or otherwise unable to obtain suitable mass transit to and from school. Carpooling can therefore be isolated socio-economically as primarily a middle and upper middle class phenomenon, since the need to carpool is generally spurred by a child's attendance at a private elementary or preschool. Carpooled children are thrust into the close company of several peers[1] and a rotating parent on a regular basis as often as ten times weekly for as long as 45 minutes per trip. For many, it is their first contact with children and adults from outside of the family and neighborhood primary groups, while it also temporally surrounds the

school experience. Thus because of its nearly simultaneous mixing of the peer, family and school influences, carpooling both frames and falls within the overlap of these three critical socializing agencies.

Carpooling also reflects the importance of the automobile in American life, since many people prefer the privacy and door-to-door convenience of driving their own car to utilizing public transportation, even when that option is available. Their youngsters therefore become inculcated into the automobile experience early in life. Surprisingly, to date, there has been a paucity of studies focused on automobile interaction of any kind.[2] Our aim in this paper is to investigate the types of interaction which take place within the carpool setting, both between children and adults and among peer group members. Behavioral patterns and roles which commonly emerge will be discussed and their impact on the developing child analyzed. The types of relationships fostered by the forced nature, temporal bounding and spatial intensity of this situation will also be considered. We conclude by assessing how carpooling socialization corresponds to each of the three sociological models presented earlier.

METHODS

It wasn't until our third year of carpooling that this phenomenon caught our interest as being worthy of sociological consideration. Previous to that time we had considered it another rite of passage into a middle class suburban subculture, often annoying, occasionally helpful, rigidly norm-bound and populated by an assortment of mundane and odd characters. But this time things were different: our child was commuting

with a single, older child of the same sex who had a domineering personality. Suddenly our daughter was beginning to change profoundly, beginning to display the attitudes and behavioral characteristics of this child. We began talking to other parents who confirmed our suspicions that carpooling could indeed have a significant socializing influence on the children involved.

We therefore decided to gather data more systematically, conducting 50 intensive, taped interviews with carpool parents and talking informally with teachers and administrators at several private schools where our sample population's children attended. Throughout this period we also heightened our observations of what was going on both during and surrounding our child's carpool as well as in the carpool experiences of friends' and neighbors' children. These interviews and observations supplemented the 800 plus carpool trips we had personally driven to camp, school and after-hours activities over the preceding three years.

A final methodological note concerns the diversity with which this topic was perceived and treated by respondants. Some considered it a fascinating area to explore, full of wide-ranging ramifications. They welcomed our interviews enthusiastically and offered sensitive observations and insights into the nature of this phenomenon. Others reacted with boredom, surprised that we would consider trying to find significance in this routine, everyday practice (by definition, the focus of sociological interest). They regarded the topic with such mundanity that detailed probing was often required to penetrate beyond their taken-for-granted outlook to the behaviors and subtle effects they had noted but shelved as "normal."

THE SETTING

Pervading and serving to unify all of the behavior that we will present here is one unifying backdrop: the automobile.[3] By far the overwhelming significance of the automobile as a setting lies in its privacy from the outside world. As Lofland (1973:136) notes, it is a "cocoon of private space," isolating its occupants from contact with strangers. It provides closure to the sounds, smells and, for the youngest children, even the sights of the outside world, turning them inward toward each other and intensifying the physical and interpersonal intimacy of their contact.

Another feature of the automobile is its physical restrictiveness: all parents interviewed either required children to be locked into place by seat belts or to sit without undue squirming in their seats. Drivers varied in their permissiveness toward seating arrangements, some assigning children to particular locations and others letting them self-select, but once the trip began the order was set and could only by changed through direct parental intervention.

Carpooling further offers children routinized regularity which can breed both security and discontent. The trip almost always follows the same routine, picking up or discharging passengers in a logical geographic sequence, and lasts for a nearly constant, predictable interval. Children are very concerned with who gets picked up and dropped off first, etc., as this affects their spatial location and exposure to the group, thereby influencing both their status in the group and their ability to have intimate time with particular others.

Lastly, the carpool experience is characterized by the involuntary

nature of children's participation and companion selection. Carpool arrangements are set up for the convenience of the parents, over which children's peer preferences have almost no influence. For example, children would rather ride in a less crowded vehicle but the optimal number of participants for parents is five drivers; children may want to avoid carpooling with an individual for the next year but most parents are more concerned about geographic propinquity than childrens' personalities (except in extreme cases), and most children would rather have their own parents drive them to and from school, yet they end up in carpools.[4] This forced companionship means that children are unable to establish a natural peer group of people whom they like; they must interact with (or withdraw from) a group of others whose composition is beyond their control, often finding themselves locked into a carpool with the same person(s) for several years.

CARPOOL INTERACTION

Within the carpool, two distinct forms of interaction can be isolated, each providing different kinds of socializing experiences. One involves the contact between the adult driving the car and his or her child passengers while the other involves communication solely among the group of children. Let us examine the form, tone and influence of these interactions separately.

ADULT-CHILD

Communication between the adult driver of the car and its youthful occupants always occurs to some degree, whether it be verbal or non-verbal, continuous or rare, directed toward parent or non-parent, child-initiated or adult-led. Parent-child interaction is the most frequent, reflecting the middle class parent's intense emphasis on quality childrearing where, as Denzin (1979:39) points out, "parents are continually reminded that the way

their child turns out is a direct reflection of their competence as socializing agents." Early in the year each carpool driver sets the tone for the amount and type of communication they will have with each child and that they will permit among the passengers, varying over a continuum of interactional styles. Let us begin by considering one of the more withdrawn models of adult behavior, the "laissez-fairist".

Laissez-fairists do not converse much with the automobile passengers once the ride gets underway. They make sure the kids are strapped into place and they then occupy themselves with their own thoughts, often playing music to enhance the separation effect between the youngsters and themselves. Laissez-faire behavior can be a habitual or occasional pattern: some parents always remove themselves, while others just do it when they are tired, distracted or in a bad mood.

When a laissez-fairist is at the wheel the children's social circle becomes liberated from constant adult supervision. Their interaction at these times comes the closest to being truly peer-dominated. They can say and do what they want to each other with minimal fear of intrusion. As one parent explained:

> I don't care what goes on back there, I'm not going to get involved. I hate driving carpool and I just get in there and grit my teeth 'til it's over. I mind my own business and let them work out whatever they get into.

Sometimes the release from parent-controlled interaction results in rowdy or nasty behavior where kids get wild or start picking on each other. In other cases it can be a welcome relief from a disliked adult.

Although some parents avowed a firm commitment to holding themsleves totally outside of the children's interactional realm, most indicated that certain occurrences would evoke some intrusive activity on their part.

"Interventionists" vary in the degree and kind of communication they engage in, ranging from those who occasionally respond to a situation, to those who are regular initiators of conversation. Once the adult displays a commitment to entering the carpool interaction, whether it be often or rare, the tone of the children's behavior changes. They know that certain standards or limitations will be enforced upon them and the interaction shifts away from peer-dominance to parent-domination. Now the parent becomes the "guardian of the situational order" (Goffman, 1963:227), ensuring that safety, morality, etiquette and all sorts of norms and values are maintained. Parents in this position must constantly make spot decisions about the intensity and style of their intervention, as children are frequently inclined to test the limits of what will be allowed.

Parents whose interaction within the carpool is elicited mainly in response to a problematic situation often find themselves cast in the role of moderator or dictator. They exercise "benign control" (Goffman, 1974), usually stopping the offensive behavior and re-directing it into a more positive vein:

> When they get into the kind of conversation I don't like sometimes I'll just interrupt and change the subject. I'll point to a billboard or some scenery and ask some question about it, or I'll bring up something that they're doing in school and try to get them all talking about it.

The parent's unchallenged ability to interrupt children's conversation reflects his or her status and power in the situation, re-affirming the dominance balance of the relationship. It also implies the children's lack of social competence, subtly asserting that their behavior is subject to open scrutiny, blunt correction and inattention (West and Zimmerman, 1977:521).

At times the subtlety of this dominance is cast aside and replaced by

open disciplinary measures. While corporal punishment is rare,[5] most adults admitted to having stopped the car until decorum was regained or to separating children who were causing problems. As one experienced carpooler explained:

> I make it my business to pull off the main street and stop the car a few times very early in the year until they behave like I'm telling them to. They always realize that they want to get home just as badly as I do so they knock it off. And that lets them know I mean business, so they pay attention to what I say.

Parents who engage in regular conversation with the carpool children comprised the largest majority of our sample and observational group. As noted earlier, this accords with both the popular childrearing norms of the class, the society and the historical period (see also Aries, 1962). Interventionists of this ilk function in both the reactionary roles just described as well as a variety of initiating modes. They may act as entertainers, teachers or "concerned" adults who care about the development and well being of each child, making sure that each one is treated equally and fairly.

One feature of carpooling which promotes easier interaction between the adults and children, facilitating their ability to get along and learn from each other, is their basic value and norm consensus. Being drawn from the same neighborhood and having selected the same school for their children, most participating families are quite homogeneous in their background, socio-economic status and childrearing standards. The role models which adult drivers provide, then, through both their instructional and disciplinary forms of interaction, usually reinforce the behavioral forms which the children encounter at home. On the occasions where there is some conflict between home standards and carpool behavior children and parents are apt to discuss this privately. After the ride is over the parent will label the unappreciated behavior as deviant, contrary to what is desired or expected. In this way parents frame their childrens' interpretations of the

situation with their own evaluations. Admirable instances of behavior are also held up as exemplary and used in the parent-child evaluative discussion as positive models for the child to absorb and emulate.

Apart from their function as educators, the most significant socializing influence carpooling adults have on children is to serve as role models, demonstrating and stressing the importance of certain values and behavioral norms. Those most endemic to the structure of the carpool setting include: appropriate automobile safety; tolerance for other people and their differences; respect for people's feelings, privacy and personal space; fairness in treating people equally; good citizenship in aspiring to admirable personal behavior and displaying good manners, and turn-taking in making sure that everyone has equal access to the limited quantity of available favorite goods.

CHILD-CHILD

In and around periods of parental intervention, children find time to interact directly with each other. It is here that the differences in their ages becomes most apparent since elementary school children have had so much more peer group experience and are so much more capable of achieving their interactional goals. The interactional dynamics of children can take many varied and complex forms, shifting rapidly and leaving old topics and allegiances completely forgotten. Let us examine the most commonly recurring interactional typologies.

Most of the children's carpool play is characterized by friendship and cooperation. This is especially true for perschoolers who are apt to greet new children enthusiastically and without reservation. Although shy at first, they make repeated attempts to find areas of commonality where they can talk and be happy. Special friendships frequently form in carpools among children of the same age and sex. These relationships can carry over beyond the carpool

to home and school where the children have additional time to spend together. One father described how his carpool formed such a bond:

> Four out of the five children in the carpool were in the same class at school and because they got to know each other in the car they really hung together in the classroom. They played in a group the whole day. When we discussed it with the teacher she said it was having a positive effect on them, that they were gaining confidence and self esteem, and would eventually branch out.

Not every parent reacts positively to an intensive carpool bond, however, as one mother illustrated:

> This younger girl in the carpool became exceedingly devoted to Kyra. They played together at school all the time. It was good for the younger kid because Kyra was teaching her everything, but she wasn't making much progress herself. I discussed this dependence with the other mother and she decided to withdraw from the carpool. After that the two girls were still friendly in school but they played with other kids. It really made a difference.

When friendship and cooperation break down they may be replaced by antagonism, meanness and hostility. Such behavior can surface on an occasional basis or it may come to pervade the carpool atmosphere, being renewed each day when children enter the car. As a temporary phenomenon, antagonism is highly influenced by the time of day. Children interact much more cooperatively on the way to school when they are well-rested and well-fed than they do on the way home when they are apt to be worn-out, cranky and more irritable. Children display meanness toward each other in the most raw, unsocialized forms, uninhibited by the restraints of good manners or social graces. Particularly prevalent mechanisms are teasing, taunting and chanting, much of which is communicated in a sing-song tone which intensifies its abrasive character. Invidious comparisons and competitiveness often spring up also, pitting one or more children against each other.

Sometimes antagonisms between the children can become more deeply rooted, carrying over from one situation to the next. When recurrent taunting and

meanness sets in it can have a lasting effect which is noticeable beyond the carpool frameworks. One child who was constantly exposed to malicious behavior would come home in tears, reporting that, "She hurt my feelings Mommy. Why does she do that?" Wounding jabs seem to penetrate more deeply among elementary school children than their younger counterparts, affecting their image and sense of self-worth. Preschool children, however, are more likely to indiscriminately imitate such behavior.

Interactional dynamics within the carpool vary sometimes with the size of the group. The two-child situation appears to structurally offer the most intense experience since participants have little diversion or escape from each other. Thrust into depth exploration of each other's personalities, they often react toward one extreme of the interactional spectrum, developing either intimate companionship or hostile antagonism.[7] When the bond is positive the children generally increase their interpersonal contact, playing together after school, but when the reaction is negative, they may still be forced to stay in the situation. Large carpools, in contrast, offer the most diffused experience, providing children with a greater range of possible friends and more sources of refuge from an unpleasant combatant. And when five or six children are in the car it is difficult for any one to constantly dominate the character of group behavior so that the overall dynamics are more varied and changing. According to parents, the most troublesome number of participants is three, for they rarely all interact smoothly throughout the ride without two ganging up on the third.

In this latter and many other situations we often note forming and shifting groups, where children create alliances with each other that last for awhile, only to abandon them and forge new ones. When allied into "withs" (Goffman, 1971:19-27), children utilize a variety of techniques to demonstrate both their

membership in the group and their closure toward outsiders. They establish a "conversational preserve" (Goffman, 1971:40) which serves as an invisible barrier, repelling unwanted intruders. Carpool groupings usually form along recurrent lines leaving some children feeling chronically excluded. One mother described her reaction to this:

> Because my child was the youngest they always left her out and called her "baby." But one day they decided to make her the center of attention and leave some other kid out. I could tell she was so happy and grateful for their friendship, so unaware of what was to come. When they abandoned her she asked me later, "Mommy, what did I do wrong?" and I relived all the pain of my own childhood.

Ganging up to shut out other children falls not only along age lines, as noted here, but along sex lines as well, since children of this age tend to gravitate toward each other in sex segregated clusterings.

When children form into groups there is usually a difference in the patterns and rationale between preschoolers and elementary school children. Older kids often affiliate themselves into status groupings organized around such determinants as age, level of accomplishment, height, strength or material possessions brought into the car. The status hierarchy can shift when birthday parties draw near or when some child has access to a desirable plaything at home that the others want to share. In contrast to this status structure is the affect structure (see Secord et al, 1976:189-99) displayed by preschoolers. Younger kids are not sophisticated enough to create status hierarchies, clustering, rather, into groups along simple likes and dislikes. And since the whimsical determinants of simple friendship are much more capricious than a status structure based on personal attributes, younger children shift groups much more frequently and unpredictably than do their older counterparts.

Whether in groups or in simple pairs, another interpersonal dynamic displayed in the carpool involves children assuming dominance and submission roles.

At these young ages they are enmeshed in the roles of teaching and being taught, whether it be by parents, school teachers or older or younger siblings. They naturally fall into such leading and following behavior, then, with older or more aggressive children dictating the interpretations, attitudes, actions and experiences formed by younger or more docile ones. Here they enforce behavioral norms (such as elementary social etiquette) onto each other, practice role modeling others and engage in the anticipatory socialization (Mead, 1934) of playing at a variety of roles. This is often a positive experience for youngsters as they gain skill at forming peer relations and get a chance to try out new roles, but several parents expressed dismay at the content of what was being communicated through this interaction. One mother articulated her reservations:

> At first I was pleased at the way Deedy was interacting with this older girl in her carpool; she's so bossy to me around the house that I was happy to see her engaged in a follower role. But then I started noticing the ideas and attitudes she was picking up from this kid and I stopped being so pleased. She was coming back with all this heavy-duty religious stuff, picking up sexist attitudes like, "you have to wear bows in your hair every day or people won't know you're a girl," and expressing negative attitudes about things that were important to us and our family like "Melanie says she hates school and so do I," or "Melanie hates her new baby and so do I."

Early carpool experiences can thus be frightening to parents as they witness the first signs of peer group influence on children who have thus far been relatively sheltered. Carpool interaction often produces the most noticeable socializing influences on first and only children who have had little previous exposure to older peers.[8]

A final dimension of carpool interaction is the one most heavily influenced by the physical setting: territoriality.[9] Undersocialized as these children are to the niceties of refined self-presentation, they stalk out,

claim and defend their "possessional territories" (Goffman, 1971:38) with a fierce, but intensely vulnerable, rawness. Their obvious degree of caring leaves them open to all kinds of encroachment as soon as petty bickering arises. Carpool territoriality usually takes two forms: sitting in a favorite place and guarding the "ecological boundary" (Cavan, 1970:561-2) immediately surrounding one's position.

Seating preferences are most easily handled by parents, for once a decision is made the issue will not arise again for the remainder of the trip. Most children prefer to sit in the front seat next to their parent on days when it is their family's turn to drive. Sitting next to favorite others or sitting in special seats (such as the third row of a station wagon or the extra front seat) can be negotiated with the adult driving and are usually arranged on either an evenly rotating basis or by the system which most successfully discourages in-fighting.

Defending intrusions into one's personal enclave cannot be as easily managed, however, and often causes interpersonal friction. Especially on the ride home, as interaction starts to degenerate due to hunger and fatigue, children typically follow an escalating pattern of baiting each other, beginning with taunting and jesting and leading rapidly into poking, intruding their arms and legs into the other's domain and eventually striking each other. This form of territorial violation is especially affected by the carpool setting, as the compounding elements of time and interactional behavior affect children's perception of their spatial boundaries; rather than having fixed notions of their territorial limits, these boundaries fluctuate when children are added to and discharged from the car and as communication ranges along cooperative and antagonistic tones. Thus, within the carpool, as Scheflen and Ashcraft (1976:4-5) note, the study of human territory goes beyond the

mere notion of space to incorporate dimensions of motion, behavior, time and context.

Overall, much of the thrust of child-child interaction is exploratory, involving social learning of group behavior. As Clausen (1968:167) writes:

> early contacts with peers no more fully socialized than themsleves puts a premium on learning rudimentary social skills--on being aware of the presence and wishes of others, on communicating one's own wishes to a non-protective other, on defending oneself or learning to enlist the aid of others to deal with an aggressor.

This role-learning is especially demanded of preschoolers who lack in basic interpersonal peer experience. Elementary school youngsters are more involved in developing and refining those roles and on polishing their adroitness at interacting competently and sophisticatedly.

DISCUSSION

Through this presentation, we have attempted to shed some light on an uninvestigated setting which serves as a socializing milieu for growing numbers of families in urban and suburban America. Carpooling stands alone as a place where children come together on a regular, forced basis that is time and space intensive. Its closest parallel environments fall short of providing participants with anything near a like experience. For example, commuters who regularly see each other en route to work may spend similar amounts of time together as these carpoolers, often being thrust into spatially enclosed physical proximity by the crowded nature of rush hour public transportation. Though they share what Hall (1969:116-19) considers "intimate spatial relations," they use "civil inattention" (Goffman, 1963:84) and other forms of non-verbal distancing (see Levine et al, 1973:208-16) to manage their experience so that little personal contact occurs. Other forms of children's transport to school, such as busing and walking, which involve both similarly

recurrent temporal spans and the intimacy of interaction with known peers, lack a different set of carpooling's features: parental supervision and forced closeness with unchosen others. Here, the ability to surround oneself with selected friends offers some protection against both the hostile combatant and the tolerated, but disliked, individual who would otherwise be thrust into the child's primary group.

A spectrum of relationships are thus begat by the carpool routine which children of this age would not ordinarily encounter. Friendly peer relationships are elevated to intimate status by the concentration and closeness of repeated exposure. Antagonistic relationships are raised to a combatant plane through the continual lack of escape from and re-irritation with the other. But perhaps unique to school carpooling is the introduction of situational relationships, where children who would otherwise avoid each other learn to benignly get along, tolerating irritating traits in each other for the sake of parental expediency. This last type of role-learning prepares them for the many similar "forced" relationships they will encounter in their adulthood: work groups; neighborhood groups; family groups; committees; conventions; interest groups, and the like.

Carpooling socialization can therefore be seen to involve all three of the socialization models depicted by sociologists. Children engage in internalizing norms and values throughout their interaction with the adult driver, as that parent role models for them the means of expediting such values as fairness, citizenship, tolerance, and respect for others. Children also police each other to learn and utilize the norms of both automobile and general etiquette, ensuring through peer pressure that these are followed by all. Secondly, children learn roles for future use through both their anticipatory role-playing activities and their involvement in intimate, combatant or situational relationships.

Lastly, children have a great deal of opportunity to develop their interactional competence by watching and engaging in interaction with peers and other adults. This is especially the case during the elementary school years when the pressures of peer group status and membership take on additional import and interactional skill becomes increasingly necessary.

While this research has offered some preliminary insights into the nature and effects of carpool behavior, interaction and relationships, the setting needs to be further investigated for adults as well as children. Future researchers could profit from looking into the interpersonal dynamics of other aspects of automobile behavior, especially in the neglected areas of driver/non-driver interaction and the relations which develop among passengers.

NOTES

1. While many sociological definitions of peer groupings require strict age bounding, we use the term loosely here, including children who fall within 3 to 4 years of each other as being in the same peer group.

2. Noteworthy exceptions have been Goffman, 1974:5-18 and Dannefer, 1977:33-38. However, these studies explore mostly driver-driver interaction and driver-pedestrian interaction, only barely mentioning the topics of driver-passenger and passenger-passenger interaction.

3. In the course of doing this research, we talked to people who drove vans, jeeps, sedans and station wagons, characterized by varying degrees of size, comfort and luxury.

4. In some cases we encountered, carpooling selection became involuntary for parents as well as children. While most situations operated under the "free enterprise" system, parents taking their own initiative to contact each other and establish a group, a few schools sponsored a "communal" structure of joint cooperation designed to help everyone into a carpool who wanted to participate in one. Here, an early fall meeting would be held where one parent who served as the school's carpool coordinator brought everyone together and made all the arrangements. Several parents noted that they were forced throughthis system into carpooling with other parents that they would otherwise have avoided.

5. A few respondants indicated their willingness to use physical discipline or their having encountered such willingness in others. One person was reported to keep a switch handy as a deterrent, while another recounted how the parent of a child in her carpool encouraged her to spank the child if she misbehaved. But most parents (in accordance with middle class childrearing norms) stated firmly their reluctance to use corporal punishment on either their own or others' children.

6. One general exception can be found among siblings who share the same carpool and carry an argument into the car which began at home.

7. Sometimes children even vary between these two, fluctuating between being good friends and hating each other.

8. It is methodologically important to note that parents of first and only children tend to be more overprotective, sensitive to the experiences they are going through and aware of subtle changes in their character. Subsequent children are not usually raised with the same degree of scrutiny.

9. While interactionists (cf. Lyman and Scott, 1970; Goffman, 1971: 30-4 and Weigert, 1981:285) have noted the importance of personal spatial preserves to the human animal, there has been little written which describes children's particular sense of and reaction toward their own territory.

REFERENCES

Aries, Philippe
1962 Centuries of Childhood. New York: Knopf.

Brim, Orville G.
1960 "Personality Development as Role Learning." In I. Iscoe and H.W. Stevenson (eds.), Personality Development in Children. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Cavan, Sherri
1970 "The Etiquette of Youth." In G. Stone and H. Farberman (eds.), Social Psychology through Symbolic Interaction. Waltham, Mass.: Xerox.

Clausen, John A.
1968 "Perspectives on Childhood Socialization," In J. Clausen (ed.), Socialization and Society. Boston: Little, Brown.

Dannefer, W. Dale
1977 "Driving and Symbolic Interaction." Sociological Inquiry 47 (1): 33-38.

Denzin, Norman
1979 "Children and their Caretakers." In P. Rose (ed.), Socialization and the Life Cycle. New York: St. Martin's.

Goffman, Erving
1963 Behavior in Public Places. New York: Free Press.

1971 Relations in Public. New York: Harper Colophon.

1974 Frame Analysis. New York: Harper Colophon.

Hall, Edward T.
1969 The Hidden Dimension. New York: Doubleday.

Levine, Janey, Ann Vinson and Deborah Wood
1973 "Subway Behavior." In A. Birenbaum and E. Sagarin (eds.), People in Places. New York: Praeger.

Lofland, Lyn
1973 A World of Strangers. New York: Basic

Lyman, Stanford and Marvin B. Scott
1970 A Sociology of the Absurd. New York: Appleton.

Mead, George H.
1934 Mind, Self and Society, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, D.R. and G. Swanson
1958 The Changing American Parent. New York: Wiley.

Parsons, Talcott and Robert Bales
1955 Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Scheflen, Albert E. (with Norman Ashcraft)
1976 Human Territories. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Secord, Paul, Carl Backman and David Slavitt
1976 Understanding Social Life. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Speier, Matthew
1970 "The Everyday World of the Child." In J. Douglas (ed.), Understanding Everyday Life. Chicago: Aldine.

Weigert, Andrew J.
1981 Sociology of Everyday Life. New York: Longman.

West, Candace and Don Zimmerman
1977 "Women's Place in Everyday Talk: Reflections on Parent-Child Interaction." Social Problems 24 (5):521-29.